DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 741 CS 511 568

AUTHOR	Pritchard, Ruie J.; O'Berry, Sandra; Butler, Patsy
TITLE	The Johnston Area Writing Partnership: The Capital Area Writing Project Model for Building District Capacity To Offer Quality Professional Development. Models of Inservice. National Writing Project at Work.
INSTITUTION	National Writing Project, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	Vol-1; No-3
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	52p.; See CS 511 566-569 for other monographs in the National Writing Project at Work series.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Writing Project, University of California, 2105 Bancroft, #1042, Berkeley, CA 94720-1042. Tel: 510-642-0963; Fax: 510-642-4545; e-mail: nwp@writingproject.org; Web site: http://writingproject.org. For full text: http://writingproject.org/downloads/nwpatworkvol1no3.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*Inservice Teacher Education; Models; *Partnerships in Education; *Professional Development; *Teacher Improvement; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	National Writing Project; *North Carolina; Teacher Consultants

ABSTRACT

The National Writing Project (NWP) at Work monograph series describes NWP work, often shared informally or in workshops through the NWP network, and offers detailed chronological accounts for sites interested in adopting and adapting the models. This monograph--"The Johnston Area Writing Partnership (JAWP)"--describes a North Carolina university-school-district partnership, seven years in the making, which has grown from an informal relationship to a funded, in-district staff development project with a mission statement and ongoing action plans. The NWP professional development model described in the monograph is a partnership between an NWP site and a district-based writing partnership created and sustained by writing project teacher-consultants, teachers who attended an invitational institute at the Capital Area Writing Project (CAWP). The monograph offers an overview of successes and struggles while providing a model for school districts wanting to establish an outreach project affiliated with an NWP site. It is divided into three parts--the first part, "Background and Initial Steps toward the CAWP-JAWP Partnership" (Ruie J. Pritchard), describes the setting and initial steps; the second part, "Inaugurating the Johnston Area Writing Partnership" (Sandra O'Berry and Patsy Butler), tells how the partnership unfolded and grew in the district; and the last part, "Final Words" (Ruie J. Pritchard; Sandra O'Berry; Patsy Butler), offers collective reflections, suggestions, and cautions to those who want to develop a satellite partnership. Appendixes contain a description of the process for conducting needs assessment; a sample teacher survey; focus group prompts; a sample executive summary of a needs assessment for grades 3 and 4; the 1995 self-assessment for administrators; the JAWP mission and vision statement; a follow-up needs assessment; tips for getting responses to surveys; a follow-

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

up survey for principals; interview protocols; topics for staff development in writing; an evaluation form for a professional development session; and a table of data. (NKA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. A. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT AT WORK

Volume 1, Number 3

Models *of* Inservice

ED 470 741

The Johnston Area Writing Partnership: The Capital Area Writing Project Model for Building District Capacity to Offer Quality Professional Development

by Ruie J. Pritchard, Sandra O'Berry, and Patsy Butler

Capital Area Writing Project
North Carolina State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 511 568

The National Writing Project at Work monograph series documents how the National Writing Project model is implemented and developed at local sites across the country. These monographs describe NWP work, which is often shared informally or in workshops through the NWP network, and offer detailed chronological accounts for sites interested in adopting and adapting the models. The programs described are inspired by the mission and vision of NWP and illustrate the local creativity and responsiveness of individual writing project sites. Written by teams of teachers and site directors—the people who create and nurture local programs—the texts reflect different voices and points of view, and bring a rich perspective to the work described. Each National Writing Project at Work monograph provides a developmental picture of the local program from the initial idea through planning, implementation, and refinement over time. The authors retell their journeys, what they achieved, how they were challenged, and how and why they succeeded.

Please see the inside back cover for more information and a list of all available titles in the NWP at Work series.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT AT WORK
Volume 1, Number 3

Models *of* Inservice

The Johnston Area Writing Partnership: The Capital Area Writing Project Model for Building District Capacity to Offer Quality Professional Development

Background and Initial Steps Toward the CAWP-JAWP Partnership
by Ruie J. Pritchard

Inaugurating the Johnston Area Writing Partnership
by Sandra O'Berry and Patsy Butler

Final Words
by Ruie J. Pritchard, Sandra O'Berry, and Patsy Butler

Capital Area Writing Project
North Carolina State University

National Writing Project
Berkeley, California

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT

The mission of the National Writing Project is to improve the teaching of writing and improve learning in the nation's schools. Through its professional development model, the National Writing Project recognizes the primary importance of teacher knowledge, expertise, and leadership.

The National Writing Project believes that access to high quality educational experiences is a basic right of all learners and a cornerstone of equity. Through its extensive network of teachers, the National Writing Project seeks to promote exemplary instruction of writing in every classroom in America.

The National Writing Project values diversity—our own as well as that of our students, their families, and their communities. We recognize that our lives and practices are enriched when those with whom we interact represent diversities of race, gender, class, ethnicity, and language.

© 2002 by the National Writing Project.
All rights reserved.
Developmental Editor: Elizabeth Radin Simons
Editors: Joye Alberts, Lisa Howard
Design: Diana Nankin, 38degrees.com

National Writing Project
University of California
2105 Bancroft, #1042
Berkeley, CA 94720-1042

Telephone: 510-642-0963
Fax: 510-642-4545
Email: nwp@writingproject.org
www.writingproject.org

FOREWORD

National Writing Project at Work, a series of monographs written by writing project teachers and site directors about their work, debuts with four monographs that describe models of inservice. Over the last few years, teachers, site directors, and national directors of the National Writing Project have begun to document and disseminate knowledge generated by NWP local site initiatives. These initiatives, inspired by the mission and vision of the NWP, include a wide range of teacher professional development models, including school site writing series, teacher research projects, statewide reading projects, summer institutes, school site coaching, and professional development designed by teachers. The monographs illustrate the local creativity and responsiveness of individual NWP sites. Collectively, they are an important body of teacher knowledge about the multiple forms of inservice teachers experience as useful and respectful. They show that there are many forms of successful professional development and support the NWP belief that there is no one right way to do this work.

Professional development of teachers is a pivotal component of school reform, and teacher voices are critical for this work to be successful. In these monographs, we hear why and when teachers commit to this work, what it does for them as educators, and how it helps change their professional self-images. We learn the authors' ideas behind their designs for reform, their grassroots theories about what it takes to transform school culture, teaching, and learning, and what support they need to do this work. The monographs show how school reform happens—how in a multitude of ways, large and small, in schools across the country, teachers make it work.

Looking at this first set of monographs, we notice several trends. First, the authors bring their extensive experience in schools, their reputations as leaders, and their extensive insider knowledge of their schools, districts, and states to their work. They wield the power of their insider status, their networks, and their knowledge of the systems to effect change. Second, they take on new roles, roles they have never played before, and, consequently, they take risks. The risk taking involves failures as well as successes, and a notable strength of the monographs is the honest voice in which each is written.

Third, while some of the monographs are reports of professional development that originated with NWP's Project Outreach Network with its explicit mission to engage teachers of students of poverty, all of the projects in the monographs have equity at their core. Each monograph describes work that targets a population of students and teachers not being served. Fourth, the teachers and site directors were—or learned to be—politically canny, seeking alliances, partnerships, and funding for their work. Fifth, these teachers are not always working in friendly climates. They are attempting reform with staffs who have burned out, or are nearing burnout, with high teacher turnover, with too many simultaneous initiatives—

in short, with all the realities of current public school education, especially in urban and rural schools of poverty.

We are pleased that the first volume of NWP at Work will include monographs about inservice programs. The work described here will have much to add to the debate about effective professional development. In these times, when a significant percentage of teachers leave the profession after five years, these monographs offer opportunities to engage teachers intellectually and feed their teaching souls. These are models of school reform that keep teachers teaching.

It is with great pleasure and pride that we introduce the National Writing Project at Work series. We are hopeful that teachers, site directors, policymakers, academics, and all who work in the realm of school reform will find much to think about in this series.

JOYE ALBERTS
Associate Director, National Writing Project

ELIZABETH RADIN SIMONS
Program Associate, National Writing Project

INTRODUCTION

Seven years in the making, this university–school-district partnership has grown from an informal relationship to a funded, in-district staff development project with a mission statement and ongoing action plans. The partnership offers two-week summer institutes, advanced training to build local leadership, school-year sessions, and continuous evaluation—all implemented in the district by teacher-consultants. This monograph offers an overview of successes and struggles while providing a model for school districts wanting to establish an outreach project affiliated with a National Writing Project site.

The National Writing Project professional development model described in this monograph is a partnership between an NWP site and a district-based writing partnership created and sustained by writing project teacher-consultants—teachers who attended an invitational institute at the Capital Area Writing Project (CAWP). The steps in establishing this outreach partnership are described by those who planned and implemented the collaboration between the Johnston Area Writing Partnership (JAWP) and the Capital Area Writing Project: Ruie Pritchard, director of the Capital Area Writing Project at North Carolina State University, and Sandra O'Berry and Patsy Butler, two teacher-consultants who work in the Johnston County Public School District. The initiative is called a writing *partnership*, rather than a *project* because JAWP is a satellite of the Capital Area Writing Project and is guided by CAWP.[1]

We've divided the monograph into three parts. Ruie, who was in at the inception and has been an ongoing consultant and mentor in the CAWP-JAWP partnership, describes the setting and initial steps. Sandra and Patsy then tell how the partnership unfolded and grew in the district. The monograph ends with our collective reflections, suggestions, and cautions to those who want to develop a satellite partnership. We should mention that the appendices are almost as long as the monograph narrative. The narrative is our journey; the appendices are the tools and processes we developed along the way. We hope these are helpful for NWP directors and teacher-consultants who want to go the satellite route or are looking for resources for their district inservice series or partnerships. We begin with Ruie's background information.

1 All NWP sites, such as CAWP, are located at colleges or universities and receive funding based on following the NWP Model, which, among other elements, includes invitational institutes that average four to five weeks in length. The Johnston Area Writing Partnership is located at a school district and offers institutes that are approximately two weeks in length.

BACKGROUND AND INITIAL STEPS TOWARD THE CAWP-JAWP PARTNERSHIP

by Ruie J. Pritchard

Johnston County: Pressures to Change Education

Johnston County's claim to fame had never been nested in education. For too long, county commissioners, good ol' boys who had been in office for years, held the purse strings and prevented improvements in education, saying that the schools had been good enough for them and were good enough for their grandchildren. Many of the citizens of the county agreed and went to the polls in 1993 to vote against a $10 million school bond.

In the early 1990s, though, with the opening of Interstate 40 from the capital city of Raleigh to Wilmington on the coast, the demographics of Johnston County began to change. In the western part of the county, I-40 created an easy commute to Raleigh and the booming Research Triangle Park. The population ballooned in this part of the county as it became a suburban bedroom community, and more middle- and upper-income students with educated parents showed up at the school doors. However, in the eastern part of the county, rural sections remained isolated and unchanged. The public school district served a population that was 70 percent Caucasian (mostly in the western part of the county), 22 percent African American, 7 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent Asian and Native American.

Irate over the conditions of the schools, newcomers moving into the western part of the state went to the polls in 1995 and passed a $50 million school bond. New county commissioners were elected and things began to change. But most schools were still poor, many students in the rest of the county were still poor, performance on state tests improved very little, and teachers felt inadequate to address the growing problems in literacy.

Even with the influx of new taxpayers, Johnston County was, and still is, not a rich district. A study published in 2001 found that 37.9 percent of households in Johnston County do not earn enough to pay for basic living expenses.[2] The school system has been challenged with finding classroom space in crowded schools while new schools are still under construction, searching for new teachers, and striving to meet the demands of the state accountability program, the ABCs of Education.

This comprehensive plan for public schools in North Carolina is organized around three goals: strong ***accountability***, an emphasis on high educational standards and the ***basics*** (reading, writing, and math), and the directive to provide schools with as much local ***control*** as possible. As a pilot program for the ABC initiative, Johnston County public schools experimented with new ways of delivering professional

2 North Carolina Justice and Community Development Center and North Carolina Equity Center, *News and Observer*, January 13, 2001, p. 14.

development to its teachers. One method was to utilize specialists in different areas in each school who could then share their knowledge with others. Those teachers who were affiliated with CAWP—and who eventually formed JAWP—recognized this model of teachers teaching teachers as a basic principle of NWP.

Before JAWP was formed, Johnston County had not offered much in the way of professional development in the area of writing. Personnel in the school district central office were overloaded with duties, and there was no district corps of curriculum consultants. Most professional growth was individually motivated, such as when a teacher requested support for a conference or participated in an NWP summer institute (CAWP had attracted nine talented teachers from Johnston County to its invitational summer institute). Follow-up was entirely dependent on how assertive teachers were about creating an audience for their presentations. Except for several one-shot workshops about the state writing test, Johnston County had never sponsored professional development in the teaching of writing.

It was in this context that JAWP began as a loose alliance of nine CAWP fellows from Johnston County and me, director of CAWP. Over time, the alliance grew into a formal partnership with open summer institutes, school-year leadership seminars, district matches for external funding, and thematic school-year follow-up to the summer institutes—all organized, conducted, and evaluated by teachers. JAWP eventually developed into a districtwide professional development program with documented success in the number of teachers who attended—flocked—to the workshops, and who changed their teaching practices as a result. JAWP is credited by the district's central office administration as helping to raise writing proficiency scores in the district.

The history of JAWP is many layered: the public story reports success in terms of rising scores on the state writing tests and voluntary participation in JAWP staff development sessions; the insider story illustrates how the work was accomplished, sometimes against all odds. From my perspective as a researcher of professional development,[3] JAWP is an underground, renegade writing partnership, the writing partnership that might have shriveled and died on the vine. It has succeeded so far primarily through the efforts of Sandra O'Berry and Patsy Butler who, as insiders, knew what they could get away with and what they could not. They took on the leadership to direct JAWP and bring it to a successful place—trusting that their efforts would be not be impeded by the district and hoping not to step on any toes in the process. In fact, the district has bolstered their grassroots achievements. Hurdles outside of the purview of Sandra and Patsy still loom large, however. If JAWP is to continue, it needs institutional commitment and support beyond the outside funding JAWP has garnered and beyond CAWP support.

Getting a Foot in the Johnston County Door

In 1993, Vann Langston arrived from the State Department of Public Instruction as the new assistant superintendent of curriculum in Johnston County. The Capital

3 Pritchard, 1987; Pritchard and Marshall, 1994; Pritchard and Marshall, 2000; Marshall and Pritchard, 2001; Marshall, Pritchard, and Gunderson, 2001a; Marshall, Pritchard, and Gunderson, 2001b; Pritchard and Marshall, 2002.

Area Writing Project at North Carolina State University in Raleigh had been serving area school districts, including Johnston County, since 1983. From his work at the state level, Vann recognized the contribution that NWP sites across the state had made to staff development. He was shocked to learn only nine teachers in five Johnston County schools had applied and attended the area NWP site. He wanted to fill the entire 1994 CAWP summer institute with Johnston County teachers. After several conversations, three teachers were accepted, bringing the number of Johnston County CAWP teacher-consultants to twelve.

In 1994, I didn't know what form the relationship between Johnston County and CAWP would take. I didn't know there would be a JAWP. But I did know from my research that for the relationship between CAWP and Johnston County to work in the long run, CAWP teacher-consultants had to make a commitment for on-site development, and the county administrators had to pledge support, including money. I also knew that we needed data to make the case to the administration. I promised to come to the county to conduct a needs assessment for Vann, which he could show to the school board and central office and use to help plan and evaluate professional development. Concern for writing was so great that financial support to improve writing performance was not a problem.

The First Johnston County Needs Assessment

CAWP contracted with Johnston County Public Schools to conduct a needs assessment of county teachers and administrators on the teaching of writing. The $3,000 contract included stipends for paying me to create the needs assessment, analyze the surveys, and write final reports; for teacher-consultants to conduct focus groups and rate the responses teachers wrote about how they taught writing; and for mileage and duplicating. (This averaged about $250 a day for CAWP coffers; we'd charge more today.)

I began by reviewing existing information provided by the county. I found that since the late 1980s, the professional development materials used for teaching writing focused on formulaic patterns and direct teaching of grammar. Johnston County students trailed in overall writing ability, but led the state at all grade levels in mastering the mechanics of writing. These students were learning what they were taught! Over the prior three years, holistic scores were consistently below state averages, with the lowest-performing schools at the elementary level. These became determinants for our original focus on including elementary teachers in the open summer institutes.

To effectively assess staff development needs, the stakeholders would have to know how writing was taught in Johnston County, whether or not teachers felt confident and receptive to help, the influence of the state test on instruction, and what kind of administrative support the teachers needed. We also needed responses to our questions from several angles, so we developed different surveys for principals, kindergarten through second grade teachers, third and fourth

grade teachers, fifth and sixth grade teachers, and seventh and eighth grade teachers. (See Appendix A for a description of processes used, Appendix B for an example of a needs assessment survey, and Appendix C for focus group prompts and guidelines for teacher-consultants.)

From the assessment data, I created a summary for each of the four grade-level clusters. (See Appendix D for excerpts from the summary for third and fourth grade teachers.) I also created a Principal's Self-Assessment (Appendix E) based on the same criteria teachers had used in their assessment to rate the administrative support they needed. Thinking that having principals compare what they viewed as important to what teachers viewed as important could be eye-opening, I suggested they take the survey as a private self-assessment before they saw the ratings by the teachers. Then, they could see the ratings of the teachers and note how they stacked up.

Getting all the Stakeholders Together

In the executive summaries, all ratings were reported in four grade-level clusters so that no teachers or schools could be identified. First, Vann shared these data with key central office personnel and the school board. Copies of the executive summaries were then compiled, along with a checkout folder of the entire report, for distribution to teachers in each school.

From the total needs assessment, I made nine recommendations to the central office, which Vann shared with the superintendent. These recommendations required actions that teachers alone could not accomplish. Although the first two recommendations were for immediate action in that they were designed for providing information and gaining support, the rest of the recommendations would need to be addressed in a timeline created by the central office.

Recommendations to the Central Office Based on Initial Needs Assessments

1. For immediate action: Principals should take the same needs self-assessment as the teachers.
2. For immediate action: A local writing advisory group should be established to create an action plan for teaching writing.
3. Representatives of the writing advisory group should be given release time or compensation to act as liaisons between administrators and classroom teachers.
4. State writing benchmarks should be used as a guide for developing a local writing curriculum.
5. Representatives from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction should be requested to visit the district to strengthen knowledge concerning expectations for, and holistic scoring of, the state tests in writing.

6. Teachers need training in the "why to" as well as the "how to."
7. Administrators should be invited to all professional development sessions.
8. Grade-level appropriate professional libraries should be available to help teachers learn basic theory and research concerning the teaching of writing.
9. On a voluntary basis, a school peer-mentoring program for writing instruction might be promoted, with a target group of first- or second-year teachers. If school-level peers are not available, then the program could be extended across and among schools.

In the beginning, Vann was our main ally in the district. After Vann shared the information from the needs assessment (see Appendix D), district support went beyond him: principals agreed that a focus on writing was a good plan, and the district accepted the recommendations. Vann held a meeting with principals, administered the personal self-assessment, and distributed the executive summaries to all the schools. Although we were not privy to detailed responses to the self-assessment activity by principals, the overall impact must have been positive because the district decided to target writing instruction for their staff development. Thus, the way for JAWP had been paved with administrative buy-in.

Since then, JAWP has succeeded through the efforts of two skilled teachers, Sandra O'Berry and Patsy Butler. Sandra attended CAWP in 1994, and she participated in the formation of JAWP. Patsy attended the first JAWP open summer institute and by the second summer was co-directing an institute with Sandra, something they have done every summer since then. Sandra and Patsy now take up the story of JAWP.

INAUGURATING THE JOHNSTON AREA WRITING PARTNERSHIP

by Sandra O'Berry and Patsy Butler

We teach in Smithfield, the largest community in Johnston County, located about an hour from the Capital Area Writing Project at North Carolina State University. About half of the outlying schools in the county are even farther away from the writing project site. We knew Ruie could not drive to our district each week to administer JAWP. Nor could Vann assume ongoing leadership, given the enormity of his other duties as assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction. For our outreach project to work, the twelve CAWP veterans in the county and Ruie all agreed to make an initial commitment of time, with the understanding that by the end of the 1994–1995 school year, additional Johnston County teacher-consultants would carry more responsibility, and eventually the county offices would assume local leadership.

In early September 1994, Vann called a meeting for the twelve Johnston County veterans of CAWP, along with Ruie and Sally Buckner, CAWP co-director. The purpose of the meeting was to devise a three-year plan for addressing writing in the curriculum. Three goals came out of this meeting:

- establish a writing advisory group
- establish a writing network across grade levels and schools
- set up a local open summer institute for Johnston County teachers.

Before the meeting was over, we had appointed ourselves as the writing advisory group. New at this, we focused on short-term goals within the three-year plan. During the remainder of the school year, we would introduce methods of teaching writing and begin the development of local leadership in the district. We planned a yearlong series of professional development sessions whose participants would be twelve CAWP teachers and representatives from each of the twenty-six schools in the district—thirty-eight teachers total.

At this September 1994 meeting the Johnston Area Writing Partnership (JAWP) was born. It would become a permanent partnership with CAWP. Being the most outspoken person in the group, Sandra became the contact person for Ruie. It was agreed that Vann would send out a memo asking principals to select a representative to JAWP from each of the twenty-six schools in order to reach every school in the district. We agreed that our initial tasks were to schedule meetings and workshops and find out who would be involved besides us.

The First Year: Planning and Training

Initially headed by Vann, JAWP held the professional development series on teaching writing with the twelve CAWP veterans (the writing advisory group) and representatives from each of the twenty-six schools. The series consisted of monthly planning and discussion meetings held from 4:00 to 8:00 P.M., from November to April. Ben Brunwin, a popular consultant from England who had worked previously with CAWP, was invited to introduce the series because he was personable, knowledgeable about the teaching of writing, and looked like Mel Gibson! We wanted the kick-off to be both inspiring and fun for those attending, and Ben's lilting accent didn't hurt either! The district also agreed to sponsor Ben to work with teachers in several large group presentations offered districtwide and also in some targeted schools.

The district paid participants $25 for each monthly meeting. The average attendance was twenty-five from the group of thirty-eight. This planning group developed the topics and format for a staff development series to be offered in the next school year, while enhancing their own expertise in the teaching of writing. The purpose was to build competence and confidence in the teaching of writing among the school representatives. In these early sessions, the twelve CAWP teacher-consultants shared strategies and lessons that they had gained from their NWP experience, and then the JAWP representatives carried the ideas and strategies back to their schools. It turned out to be a good way to inaugurate JAWP because this loose network helped not only to disseminate information about good writing practices, but also to advertise the upcoming professional development opportunities in writing, such as our first open institute in summer 1995.

1995: JAWP's First Open Summer Institute

In summer 1995, we offered our first open institute, which we called level I. The writing advisory group designed a plan for a two-week open institute based on the NWP invitational institute model and divided up responsibilities for recruiting participants, engaging guest presenters, and creating the daily schedule. Everyone did what he or she had committed to. We were efficient, skilled, and energized from the beginning because we had all been CAWP writing project fellows who had all been down the summer institute road the hard way—in intensive month-long summer institutes. We really didn't have any trouble getting the open summer institute off the ground. Our needs were so great in the county that everyone bought in to it immediately.

We ran two open institutes concurrently, each lasting two weeks, in a streamlined version of the Capital Area Writing Project invitational summer institute. They were facilitated by four instructors who had been in the monthly school-year professional development sessions and who had either participated in an NWP institute or in Ruie's university class on the teaching of composition. Bobby Cox and Sandra taught one; Amy Stanley and Nan Massengill taught the other. The district provided $500 stipends for each participant, and CAWP paid for consultants for the institute and follow-up, and also for university tuition for interested participants.

Through these two simultaneous institutes, we introduced thirty-seven Johnston County teachers to effective strategies for the teaching of writing and increased the number of Johnston County teachers trained using the writing project model of "teachers teaching teachers" from twelve to forty-nine.

The JAWP open summer institute seemed demanding to the participants because it was the first time that they had experienced professional development that went on for two weeks. The days included writing time, peer group sharing, and teacher demonstrations. Since it was just two weeks, we worked them to a frazzle and really crammed in a lot of what is included in the longer CAWP institutes. Deadlines came fast. Participants moaned and groaned, but we made them laugh and we kept feeding them, which seemed to ease their pain.

But we didn't just feed them. We created a party atmosphere by using tablecloths on the refreshments table and using serving bowls for snacks instead of just opening bags. We brought cut flowers from our gardens. At "aha" moments, when a piece of writing or a comment let us know that they were getting the big picture, we put on huge sunglasses because the participants were so "bright." The teachers wanted to see us wearing the sunglasses as often as possible. They responded to these extras with comments in the evaluations saying they had learned so much and it was so much fun. Several people commented on these little additions saying it made them feel appreciated and important since we went to the extra trouble. Knowing that we were on to something big, we continued to do these things with the activities we offered during the school year. When faced with a buffet of nicely presented refreshments at the end of a long, hard working day, teachers relaxed and were ready to learn.

Starting with this first open institute and continuing throughout our work, we have tried to offer our colleagues what we appreciate ourselves—not only good instructional tips and theories, but also good press. After each institute, we write letters to each teacher's principal, telling him or her that the teacher has participated in an intensive writing training and has many new ideas to share. We include a copy of the participant's position paper and implementation plan. The position paper states what the participant believes about how young people grow as writers and a philosophy about teaching writing. The implementation plan contains specific strategies for incorporating writing into the classroom and ideas for sharing with colleagues. This information establishes a starting point between teacher and administrator for conversations about school-based efforts for improving writing instruction.

The evaluations we received from the summer participants are something we return to when we are feeling overwhelmed about managing JAWP while teaching full-time. Here are samples of comments from the first sessions in 1995:

> Principals should have to do this!
>
> The summer institute was super! The instructors were excellent and because they knew "our kids," were far better than outside "experts." They were professional and willing to work with us. They improved us in spite of ourselves.
>
> What we did was wonderful and the sharing sessions created a certain cohesion that did not formerly exist among the schools.

> Talking with other teachers and sharing ideas was a wonderful opportunity in the summer institute, something we don't get to do enough. This institute should be continued because it is a great way to inform teachers about aspects of the writing process.

Teachers Keeping the Momentum Going: 1995 and Beyond

In 1995, after only forty-nine teachers had participated in summer institutes, the district seemed disappointed that scores across the district did not rise dramatically! At that point, Vann was still running the show and administrating the group. The writing advisory group and JAWP network participants felt that too much of our time in district meetings was spent disseminating information and planning an agenda rather than giving teachers opportunities for sharing and writing. Sandra, a teacher-leader, took a big step. She spoke up and took the helm. Teachers began writing and sharing—and eating!—at the beginning of every district meeting.

When teachers take over leadership, as Sandra did, there are positive and negative consequences. The positive is that the district let us have free rein, planning, implementing, and evaluating what we felt was needed. The negative is that when the district relinquished leadership to us, the district no longer had ownership. We got used to accomplishing our writing project goals alone and on our own time, and even now many people at the county office still don't know that JAWP exists.

By the second year of JAWP summer institutes and yearlong staff development sessions, writing scores on the state tests were moving in the right direction, showing overall improvement countywide. With this success, we were able to gain more support for JAWP: the district continued to provide space in the calendar and facilities for ongoing professional development, duplicating expenses, refreshments for school-year sessions, and stipends for the institute participants. Ruie agreed to stay on as a volunteer consultant to the writing advisory group. Having her "on call" gave us the confidence we needed to continue with JAWP, a project that steadily kept growing.

Leadership Seminars: What Teachers Need in Order to Become Leaders

Right from the start, we knew that we wanted to train teacher-leaders in Johnston County along with improving the teaching of writing. To accomplish this goal of building local leadership, we made a plan for a series of leadership seminars, which we called level II. We have offered this training, held in spring, five of the last six years. Although held on-site in Johnston County, teachers with leadership potential from other counties are invited. CAWP pays tuition for those who want university credit, although many who already hold a master's degree or simply aren't interested in graduate credit participate without this bonus. Ruie teaches the level II leadership seminars, usually along with a CAWP teacher-consultant. The workshop titles have included: Planning and Implementing Staff Development (1996), Computers and Composition (1997), Teacher as Researcher (1998), Professional Writing for

Teachers (1999), and Aligning the Elementary Writing Curriculum with State Benchmarks (2001). The same working group of approximately thirteen JAWP teachers, including us, has participated in all workshops.

Each level II seminar has had a particular product or impact that has moved JAWP forward and gained it more credibility. For example, in the first leadership seminar, Planning and Implementing Staff Development, we designed a brochure and created the JAWP–CAWP Mission and Vision statements (see Appendix F). For the Teacher as Researcher seminar, we undertook a qualitative study of our district, including central-office policymakers, principals, and teachers in twenty-seven schools. Along with Ruie, we presented our experiences at the NCTE Annual Convention in Nashville in fall 1998, and in Myrtle Beach at the 1999 NWP Rural Sites Network Spring Retreat. Three teachers from the level II seminar, Professional Publishing for Teachers, along with Ruie, published an article about the text that was read for that class (Parker Palmer's *Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*) in *The Quarterly*.[4] Articles about JAWP have appeared in *Spotlight on Success*, a district educational newspaper, and in the September 2000 issue of *The Voice*. In March 2001, a CAWP teacher-consultant presented a session at the Rural Sites Network Spring Retreat in Alabama about her work as a teacher-consultant in a school in our district. We are eager for our story to be known beyond the county boundaries. We think we have earned the right not only to share, but to boast. As the ball player Dizzy Dean said, "It ain't braggin' if you really done it!"

We are always pursuing external funding. We have found a high rate of success receiving grants when we drop names and mention our association with the Capital Area Writing Project, the National Writing Project, DeWitt Wallace–Reader's Digest Fund, and NWP Project Outreach Network, to name a few of our funders. The names send a message that we have previously received grant funds and have some experience with planning and management. Individual JAWP teachers have received funding from the North Carolina English Teachers Association for innovative projects ($950), the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education (NFIE) ($1,000), and Chapbooks ($250). By tying technical innovation with the JAWP network, our district received a two-year grant from the Clinton Technology and Literacy initiative ($250,000). On behalf of JAWP, Ruie and CAWP have also received grants that pertain to work in our district: NCSU Professional Development grant ($3,000), NWP Rural Sites Network ($3,000), NCWP Evaluation Project ($20,000 over two years), and NWP Project Outreach Network ($27,000).

4 *The Quarterly of the NWP*, Vol. 21, no 4, Fall 1999.

Project Outreach Network 1996–2000: The Boost We Needed!

Somewhere along the way, we started calling Ruie our *grant*mother because she found ways to make things happen for us. Thanks to her willingness to write grants and seek out opportunities, our site became part of NWP's Project Outreach Network (PON) in 1996. Sponsored by the DeWitt Wallace–Reader's Digest Fund, PON gave JAWP the boost that the partnership needed. At that time—before our level II institutes—we had a good level I program established, but we were unsure what our next steps should be. PON was a network of eighteen NWP sites across the nation focused on extending the quality and quantity of NWP services to teachers of poor children. It provided, over a three-year period, $27,000, plus travel expenses to national meetings and summer institutes, which would build on our foundation of staff development initiatives. The additional funding from this grant allowed Johnston County teachers to meet with other teachers in the PON network to share and collect ideas for creating professional development relevant to the goals of PON.

There was a lot we didn't know when we got the PON grant, the first money given directly to JAWP for use within our control, not the school district's. We had to plan what to do with it and how to budget. PON changed us; we had to become local leaders and focus more explicitly on the teachers of poor children in the county. We had to make decisions! Before PON, we were a bit naïve about our project, but we were greatly helped by our meetings and work with our PON colleagues and friends across the nation. From them, we recognized the need to tailor training to the stated needs of teachers and administrators. Our ideas about developing local leadership were confirmed. We realized a strong direction was particularly needed for teachers of economically poor students, 36 percent of our district. We targeted nine elementary and middle schools that were feeder schools into the high school with the greatest percentage of students on free or reduced lunch; the percentages ranged from a low of 18.47 percent in one school to the highest in the district, a school with 90.4 percent of students identified as economically deprived.

To meet the PON requirement for a year of self-study, we set out to learn what would make professional development appealing to teachers of poor students. We developed a second teacher survey and got a 30 percent return—314 responses. (See Appendix G for Follow-Up Survey of Teachers; and Appendix H for Sandra's Tips on How to Get Good Responses to Surveys.) Patsy interviewed principals by email and by letter, requesting information on specific professional development activities. Sandra interviewed selected JAWP participants, teachers from PON who worked in the economically poor schools, and a few volunteers, so we would have information from as many schools as possible, using both face-to-face and mailed surveys. (See Appendix I for Follow-Up Survey of Principals, and Appendix J for Interview Protocol.)

From our surveys, we found out that people who had attended our summer institutes thought they did *not* know enough about teaching writing, and that people who had not attended a summer institute thought they knew *everything*. We found

out why people came to JAWP activities: to learn techniques for teaching writing, to learn more about the forms of writing tested, and to get renewal credit. We also learned why they did not attend JAWP sessions: too busy, too many other after-school commitments, too tired, pressing family obligations, participation not required by district, stipends not enough, too many other initiatives going on, and our personal favorite for participating in JAWP in only a limited way: "I did not sign my life away to JAWP just because I attended a few meetings."

We also gathered information about: principals and the kind of support they did or did not receive or offer to their staff; whether or not principals received direction from the central office for staff development; if principals participated in staff development themselves; whether or not the school has a writing team or a school writing plan; and if any follow-up or observations take place to ensure that teachers are actively involved in teaching writing.

From these surveys, we found support for what Ruie's national research suggests: district support for staff development at all levels is central to high levels of participation and improvement, with the most important factor for schools with high writing scores being administrators who say that writing is to be taught across the curriculum and mean it. A common denominator across successful schools in our survey—whether or not they targeted economically poor students—was a principal who created a shared vision for improvement among all the teachers on the staff and who believed that teachers could improve their teaching of writing and that students can improve as writers.

We assessed the needs of students and teachers and found that they shared weaknesses in the same areas: revision, using peer groups, and relating the rubrics for the state test to the various modes tested. With this new information, we created a thematic menu for the 1997–1998 school year consisting of professional development activities related to the expressed interests of teachers as well as to the weaknesses uncovered in our assessments of teachers and student writing (see Appendix K).

This was a very different kind of staff development from our first effort, which had offered a smorgasbord of unrelated activities that were not based on data gathered locally and that were not focused on the declared needs and interests of teachers. In the new series, we offered a variety of sessions for teachers who had advanced knowledge about teaching writing as well as sessions offering basics. One measure of our success was that none of these staff development sessions were required, yet attendance at the majority of the presentations was record breaking. A second measure was good attendance by teachers from economically poor schools. We had listened to their needs for building basic knowledge and skills and offered them workshops such as Untangling the Mystery of Rubrics and Assessments; Revision; Peer Groups; Writing in Math; and Super Sentences. A third measure was the overall satisfaction shown by the evaluations of individual sessions (see Appendix L). Finally, our postseries survey indicated that the thematic menu was well received by teachers. Specifically, some staff development practices were confirmed as successful.

- Participants loved the fact that presenters were local teachers who had actually taught the lessons and worked with the students in our district. The hands-on aspect of the presentations was also popular. Teachers doing what they normally told students to do made for a better understanding of the process. Having a variety of topics from which to select was a plus as well.
- Participants enjoyed being pampered with great refreshments, not just the usual bland boxed cookies from the school cafeteria. Food is important in any writing project and in any staff development offering!
- The presenters liked the opportunity to show off their knowledge, share their students' work, and be seen as leaders in the teaching community.

We also gained insight on how to schedule.

- Attendance was best September through February, with the exception of the busy month of December.
- The state writing tests are administered during the first week of March, and after that, teachers are focused on specific test-taking skills. They are less likely to attend voluntary staff development sessions during this time.

PON not only gave us the lens with which to look at teaching poor students; it made our model stronger and we grew as leaders and responded to local needs. Before PON, we were a local operation; PON helped shape and affirm our work and provided us with a national forum where we presented our project to NWP sites from across the country. This leadership training, along with the level II leadership seminars, was the catalyst for writing about our project and presenting it at conferences.

In the following final section, we all reflect on the CAWP-JAWP partnership. We talk about statistical evidence of its success, reflect on why it has worked to date, and identify the challenges JAWP now faces.

by Ruie J. Pritchard, Sandra O'Berry, and Patsy Butler

Statistics can be a project's best friend, and we have good statistics in both student scores and teacher participation in JAWP. Proficiency scores of students in the district on the state writing test have increased for nearly every year since 1994 when JAWP began staff development in the teaching of writing. For example, the district averages for the fourth grade writing test have moved from 22.6 percent of students earning a passing score in 1993 (below the state average) to 58.2 percent in 2000 (above the state average). Our 2001 assessment indicates that 64 percent of fourth-graders earned a passing score. Growth trends prior to JAWP suggest that this improvement is greater than expected.

Sandra has kept meticulous records to document the impact of JAWP, including teacher participation. From 1994 to 2001, JAWP has offered a total of twelve open summer institutes involving 207 participants. The number of individual teachers who have attended school-year follow-up offerings has grown from 37 in 1994–1995 to 202 in 2000; many are repeat participants. Over the years of JAWP, the combined teacher contact hours in staff development in writing is estimated to be 16,783 (see Appendix M).

One reason for our success is our support networks and collaborations, both local and national. Because we banded together in a partnership that included people outside our district and created an in-district network, we have accomplished a great deal in a short time. JAWP would have long ago drained our energy and resources if we had not built support networks with CAWP and with NWP teachers in other sites. Nationally, new understanding and motivation came from JAWP leaders interacting with the participants at the PON summer institute, working with the national coordinators, and attending and presenting at the national conferences of NWP and NCTE. Moreover, Sandra and Patsy's enthusiasm has brought new life and input into CAWP summer institutes. Beginning in summer 2001, Sandra serves as co-director of the Capital Area Writing Project at NCSU. Patsy has assumed more of the leadership responsibilities for JAWP, though Sandra will continue with JAWP as well.

The CAWP-JAWP partnership has gained some local recognition. Keith Beamon, Johnston County Assistant Superintendent for Instruction who replaced Vann, commented in the Raleigh *News and Observer* regarding the rising test scores in the district: "The district has continued to use the Johnston Area Writing Project [Partnership], which it has used to teach writing for several years....Under the Johnston program, NC State University assists schools in teaching students how to

write."[5] North Carolina State University recognized Ruie in spring 2001 as one of three Alumni Distinguished Professors for her service to JAWP and other sites.

By spring 2000, the district realized that the JAWP consultants could be very useful to accomplish parts of the district agenda. When the state allowed local portfolio assessment for students who had not passed the state writing test, the district went to JAWP to find teachers who knew how to do this kind of assessment and paid the teachers the same money that "real" consultants earn. Last year, JAWP teacher-consultants were asked to provide a program in writing for the pre–school-year staff development for all third and fourth grade teachers. The supervisor for curriculum and instruction also informed JAWP leaders that she didn't want to "lose good trainers to another district" when another district agreed to pay Patsy and Sandra more than twice what JAWP had paid them for leading open summer institutes. The supervisor made a commitment to support JAWP institutes in 2001 and 2002.

In the last two years, JAWP has gained recognition in neighboring counties. Other districts have approached Ruie saying, "We want what Johnston County has!" In summers 2000 and 2001, the CAWP-JAWP partnership conducted two trainings in another district, Durham Public Schools. Ruie conducted a level II writing project on technology and writing, while Sandra and Patsy led a level I open institute. Durham Public Schools has now created a second partnership with CAWP as an urban site affiliated with the NWP Urban Sites Network, just as JAWP affiliated with the NWP Rural Sites Network. Sandra and Patsy conducted other open institutes in 2001 and 2002.

Giving a proper name to the district-university relationship—the CAWP-JAWP partnership—with a mission statement and an action plan, and joining the PON network, gave local credibility to JAWP endeavors both in the university and in the district. Through multiple memberships in such national organizations as NWP, PON, Rural Sites Network, and NCTE, and through this monograph, JAWP is also getting national recognition.

Vann Langston was the catalyst for a positive route that has been maintained even though Vann has since left the district for another position. Consequently, JAWP has passed quite a test, since most of the literature on school reform indicates that when the leaders leave the district, the reform efforts die out. In this case, JAWP did not die out because Sandra and Patsy took over the nuts and bolts of keeping it going. The leadership and capacity building in JAWP that began with Sandra and Patsy were nurtured and sustained by CAWP and PON. Over the years, the CAWP-JAWP partnership has insinuated itself into various projects in the district, becoming useful to the district in accomplishing its goals—such as helping to write a technology and literacy grant for the district, conducting the district portfolio assessment, and developing a district writing curriculum based on state standards. JAWP has gained recognition and credibility in a lengthy process that we call "institutionalization by osmosis."

5 *News and Observer*, May 24, 2000, p. 17A.

Today, the CAWP-JAWP partnership still primarily consists of Sandra, Patsy, and Ruie. Without released time from teaching, they plan, implement, evaluate, and maintain funding for district professional development in the teaching of writing. However, keeping the momentum going in a district writing project is an enormous and sometimes exhausting undertaking for classroom and university teachers with full-time loads. For JAWP to sustain itself, a cadre of new leaders must be constantly nurtured, and a long-term commitment from the district's central-office personnel—who control budgets and schedules—is necessary. The truth of the matter remains that if Sandra, Patsy, and Ruie don't initiate some things, they aren't done.

The first challenge is to build ongoing local teacher leadership. Other trained JAWP teachers must step up to the plate and take on various responsibilities. Collaboration with CAWP veterans in other districts, such as the Durham Public Schools, is being explored for possibilities of mutual support and an exchange of teacher-consultants.

The second challenge is for ongoing financial support and more broad-based district support. JAWP would not have succeeded thus far without the underwriting by CAWP and outside funders. However, the entire NWP professional development model—open summer institutes and follow-up—has not been fully adopted in the district. JAWP competes with many other initiatives for time and space. JAWP still needs a designated line item in the budget that assures that support will be ongoing; concerted efforts by the district for job-embedded follow-up; released time for teachers such as Sandra and Patsy who take on substantial leadership roles; trained principals who support and recognize good writing instruction; and, finally, a central-office administrator who advocates the JAWP cause to the superintendent and the school board.

For example, Johnston County does not have in place a district writing curriculum that extends across grade levels and content areas. Also, professional development plans for after-school sessions for the current year and next year have been compromised because the district is constrained by a bus schedule that requires schools to end at different times so buses can make double runs. Some teachers get out of school at 2:30 P.M. while others stay until nearly 4:00. JAWP would have to offer sessions in two time periods to accommodate this, which would entail JAWP teacher-consultants being released from their own schools to travel to other sites, or the district arranging released time for a large number of teachers to participate during the school day. Additionally, the district is limiting the number of days teachers can be out of their classrooms for professional development activities, so that JAWP is competing with other programs for teachers' time. The solutions for these kinds of budget and scheduling problems are out of reach for classroom teachers; JAWP needs central-office advocacy and intervention and more school-level leadership by principals who are knowledgeable about NWP ideals. For example, teachers are not in the position to require that their principals' meetings entail more than information dissemination or to require training in the teaching of writing for all new hires.

While JAWP has recognition and success on many fronts, it is housed in a district still frantically coping with changing demographics and a rising population, a district that does not yet have in place a fully developed writing curriculum or professional development plan in the teaching of writing sponsored by the central office. Ironically, though JAWP is still trying to make headway at home, we are now sharing what we have learned in this publication that will have national distribution. We hope that our experience will help to guide the decisions and processes of teachers taking on the formidable task of planning, implementing, and evaluating staff development in their districts. The CAWP-JAWP partnership offers the following recommendations to help NWP teacher-consultants begin this satisfying but time-consuming task in their home districts.

Recommendations for Developing a District-Based Professional Development Initiative

- Start with a writing advisory committee that includes representatives from the district's central office and from the area NWP site.
- Form a network across schools within your district.
- Establish a support system outside the district. Elicit the help of your area NWP site. Ask for advanced (level II) workshops or seminars on topics that will develop teacher-leaders. Ask for the help of NWP teacher-consultants from other districts who can come to your site.
- Define yourself: create a mission statement, a vision statement, and an action plan to remind you of your purpose and direction. Return to these and update them.
- Tie your mission and vision directly to that of your district; renegade projects do not succeed in public schools.
- Include district administration in your planning stages; make sure that all stakeholders are involved.
- Gather data. Data should include: information from initial and follow-up needs assessments; numbers of participants in summer trainings; attendance at school-year staff development; amount of outside funding; workshop evaluations; correspondence with and recommendations to central office; articles in newspapers and journals; standardized test scores; teacher testimonials; student portfolios; etc.
- Make yourself visible. Advertise your initiative to your community and to your district administration. Create a brochure. Get a "good-press-for-teachers" type of article in your local paper. Write articles for *The Voice*, *The Quarterly*, and other professional journals. Copy them to your administrators when they are published. Get on the program of regional, state, and national conferences. Ask to speak at district meetings of principals. Get on the agenda for a school board meeting or PTA meeting. Make an appointment with the superintendent. Don't be humble or work in silence!

- Apply for funding. Use your visibility and data to apply for grants, large and small. Tie all this money together under the auspices of your writing partnership. Don't forget to drop names if you have well-known connections.
- Advocate for job-embedded professional development for teachers. Cite research that shows: effective staff development is ongoing and job-embedded, not something "extra" expected of teachers; administrators, especially principals, need to be involved in ongoing training; a corps of skilled teacher-trainers should be supported by a central office that has a primary job of serving the professional needs of teachers.
- And don't forget: provide good refreshments for your staff development sessions, and celebrate the "bright ideas" of your colleagues!

REFERENCES

Marshall, J. C., and Pritchard, R. J. April, 2000. "The Anatomy of Systemic Change Through Staff Development: A Systems Perspective." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Marshall, J. C., Pritchard, R. J., and Gunderson, B. 2001. "The Relation Between District Health and Total Quality: Implications for Educational Policy." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Marshall, J. C., Pritchard, R. J., and Gunderson, B. February, 2001. "Professional Development: What Works and What Doesn't Work." *Principal Leadership* 1.6: 64–68.

Pritchard, R. J. 1987. "Effects on Student Writing of Teacher Training in the National Writing Project Model." *Written Communication: A Quarterly Journal of Research, Theory, and Application* 4.1: 51–67.

Pritchard, R. J., and Marshall, J.C. October, 1994. "Evaluation of a Tiered Model of Staff Development in Writing." *Research in the Teaching of English* 28.3: 259–285.

Pritchard, R. J., and Marshall, J. C. April, 2000. "Holistic Versus Fragmented Staff Development: An Index to District Quality." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Pritchard, R. J., and Marshall, J. C., 2002. "Professional Development in 'Healthy' Versus 'Unhealthy' Districts: Top Ten Characteriscics Based on Research." *School Leadership and Management* 20.2 (in press).

APPENDIX A: PROCESSES FOR CONDUCTING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

by Ruie J. Pritchard

I organized a team of CAWP teachers, including Johnston County teachers, to look at several model instruments used to assess needs in staff development. This gave us some ideas to develop our own. We followed the general rule for creating surveys—ask only for the information that you really need. Since we needed the perspectives of several groups, we developed different surveys for principals, kindergarten through second grade teachers, third and fourth grade teachers, fifth and sixth grade teachers, and seventh and eighth grade teachers. The assessment for teachers was two-part; in section I we gathered information on the teaching of writing and in section II on administrative support (see Appendix B for assessment questions). We would recommend to others several components of this assessment. One is to gather the surveys in a mandatory meeting. This ensures a timely and high return from teachers, whereas mailed-in responses tend to have low returns. We held two districtwide meetings on different days—one for kindergarten through fourth grade teachers, and one for fifth through eighth grade teachers. Teachers were given early release to attend the meetings. Additionally, we asked the district to provide refreshments for these after-school sessions. We had a 56 percent return of the seven-page assessment in those two sessions, gathering 281 out of a possible 500.

A second good component to use when assessing needs is to use focus groups with scribes and facilitators. The sessions were conducted by paid CAWP teacher-consultants from other districts who taught at the same grade levels. Right after the written survey, the teacher-consultants met in small groups with Johnston County teachers, without administrators present. One teacher-consultant led the discussion while another took notes. This allowed the teachers to express opinions and elaborate beyond their written responses. (The guidelines for focus groups facilitators and the discussion prompts are available in Appendix C.)

To create the survey for teachers, we drew extensively upon the skills of CAWP teacher-consultants whose students had been successful on the state tests. To create the assessment of knowledge about, and use of, successful practices for teaching writing, we used both a checklist and an essay. The checklist was derived from interviews with CAWP teacher-consultants at the grade levels used in the survey. The students of these teacher-consultants had scored well on the state writing tests. I questioned the teachers for specific classroom activities they used to develop writing skills and to prepare students specifically for the state test.

The essay asked teachers to write about a specific writing lesson that typified how they teach. We found the essay to be less intimidating than administering a knowledge test about best practices. Especially revealing were responses to this question: "Briefly describe how you address the stages of the writing process in your instruction." This question efficiently illustrated gaps in teacher knowledge and thus provided valuable information about what topics for staff development we needed to address first. To evaluate teacher knowledge, paid CAWP teacher-consultants at various grade levels read these essays and developed descriptors of what they considered high-quality instructional methods for teaching writing as well as strong understanding of developmental features in writing on down to low quality and minimal understanding. We created a four-point rating scale. Similar to holistically ranking student essays, the teacher-consultants identified anchor papers from the pool that characterized each rating. These became the rubric against which CAWP teacher-consultants holistically rated each teacher description of how he or she taught writing and assigned a rating from 0 to 3. The criteria were:

> 0 = way off base; failure to respond at all; may mention practices, but not writing processes per se; cannot really decipher the practices that the teacher uses.
>
> 1 = weak response, showing little understanding of the writing process; may mention only one stage of the process or merely lists stages.
>
> 2 = satisfactory understanding; at least three stages or processes mentioned; some stages described.
>
> 3 = strong understanding, including all stages of the writing process.

It is important to gather baseline data in your district in order to determine growth and impact. Over the years of the project, we changed the kind of assessments we used (see Appendices E, F, I, and J). We also repeated the essay question in 1995 and 1996 for comparison with teachers' initial knowledge about teaching writing.

APPENDIX B. EXAMPLE OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY FOR TEACHERS

Please indicate the grade level you teach:_____

1. Rate yourself on a 1–5 scale on how you feel about writing:

(1)..... (2)..... (3..... (4)..... (5)

I hate to write **I love to write**

Section I: Developing Writing Ability

2. Rate yourself along a 1–5 scale on your ability to implement with your children all the stages of the writing process:

(1)..... (2)..... (3)..... (4)..... (5)

I am very insecure **I am very confident**

3. Briefly describe how you address the stages of the writing process in your instruction. (Use back.)
4. What writing skills, attitudes, and abilities in the area of writing do you think need to be developed before students come to the grade level you teach?
5. What specific writing skills, attitudes, and abilities do you think are important to develop at your grade level?
6. For what reasons do you think that your students (or students in your school) did well on the Fourth Grade North Carolina Writing Test?
7. What specific skills do you think that your students (or students in your school) lack that could account for their performance on the Fourth Grade North Carolina Writing Test?
8. For what reasons do you think that your students (or students in your school) did poorly on the Fourth Grade North Carolina Writing Test? (These could include reasons in addition to lack of specific skills.)
9. During this last school year, which of the following learning activities did you provide for your students that helped prepare them for the Fourth Grade North Carolina Writing Test? (Check all that apply; add others below, if necessary.)

___a. Students take their own writing through all the stages of the writing process.

___b. I have my students write in journals at least three times a week.

___c. My students write for real audiences and frequently share their writing with that audience.

___d. Students frequently share writing for peer response.

___e. I model for students how to ask questions about one's own writing and that of one's peers.

___f. I allot much time for writing in class.

___g. I allot much time for students to tell stories orally.

___h. Students practice staying on the topic when telling stories.

___i. Students practice sequencing events by retelling the stories of books they have read.

___j. My students can identify a story's beginning, middle, and end.

___k. My students practice specific strategies for how to begin a paper.

___l. My students practice specific strategies for how to end a paper.

___m. My students keep portfolios of work-in-progress.

___n. My students do reflective writing about their own works and their own writing processes.

___o. I use examples from the SDPI Focused Holistic Scoring Guide for narrative writing to teach students the differences between high- and low-rated papers.

___p. Students practice applying the SDPI scoring standards to their own papers and those of their classmates.

___q. I design lessons to make students aware of the definitions that distinguish the two kinds of narrative writing used on the state test.

___r. I ask students to bring in examples of narrative writing that they find, such as in magazines and newspapers.

___s. I frequently provide students sample prompts in which to respond.

___t. I teach students key words and phrases in prompts that help them follow directions (for example, *pretend* signals an imaginative narrative that they make up, and *tell about* signals a story from their own lives).

___u. I give specific lessons on transition words.

___v. I teach strategies for varying sentence structure.

___w. I teach strategies for sentence elaboration.

___x. Other strategy (write in).

_____

_____

___y. Other strategy (write in).

_____

_____

Section II: Administrative Support

10. Please rate the following behaviors of school administrator(s) in terms of their importance to you:

Administrator:

a. understands the writing process:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

b. understands the role of writing in the learning process:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

c. promotes writing as important in the total curriculum:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

d. knows what's happening in my classroom:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

e. distributes information on staff development offerings (within and outside of district) and books and materials relevant to teaching writing:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

f. makes the SDPI materials on the writing test accessible:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

g. creates opportunities for me to work with teachers in my grade level and across grade levels:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

h. offers me personal and professional support:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

i. is open to my input and ideas:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not very important to me **very important to me**

11. What specific staff development topics relevant to the teaching of writing, in which would you like to see addressed over the next two years? (Use back, please.)

12. List any helpful staff development sessions relevant to the teaching of writing in which you have participated in the last two years.

13. Is there anything else that you would like to say that is relevant to this survey?

APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP PROMPTS AND GUIDELINES FOR TEACHER-CONSULTANTS

Guidelines for Teacher-Consultants

Your job is to gather information, not deliver a staff development workshop. Also, don't allow the focus group to become a gripe session; steer the group to new topics if they get bogged down. Try to probe, while effacing yourself. Assure them that their comments will be summarized, but will be anonymous.

Sample Prompts for Focus Group Discussions

1. Did the survey provoke any ideas that you would now like to address?
2. What stages of the composing process give you the most trouble?
3. What ideas do you have about the format and time of staff development sessions?

   Individualized by schools and grade levels? Should the district offer a menu of options from which you choose? Would you be willing to attend Saturday half-day sessions? Would you want a teacher-consultant to visit your classroom? Would you prefer local facilitators and presenters or someone from another district?
4. What would enable you to gain more from staff development in your district?
5. How much influence or pressure do parents exert on you? Would you want some of the staff development to involve parents as participants?
6. For you, what has been missing in staff development offerings in the past?
7. How would you rank writing in relationship to all the other content and skills that you must address in your teaching?
8. Is there any special student group with which you need help, e.g., English lan guage learners, gifted, lower ability?
9. Do you have any ideas on how school or district administration might help make your responsibilities in teaching writing any easier?
10. What other ideas do you have relevant to this topic?

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF A NEEDS ASSESSMENT GRADES 3 AND 4

The teacher-consultants representing the Capital Area Writing Project (CAWP) were sympathetic with many of the Johnston County teachers struggling to improve test scores. They had been there themselves, and only over time have they been able to achieve the kind of performance on test scores that seems more in alignment with the daily work that they get from their students. As reported in the newspaper since CAWP teacher-consultants were in Johnston County for the focus groups, the students of all four teacher-consultants achieved higher scores than the Wake County average, and students of three of the four teacher-consultants achieved the highest scores in the county. This achievement has happened only after concerted effort over the years and across the grade levels.

A copy of the prompts given to teacher-consultants for discussion in the focus groups is attached. This narrative summary takes information from the discussions and the written surveys.

The thirty-two fourth grade teachers and thirty-one third grade teachers in the Johnston County sessions were described by two of the five scribes as revealing a "combination of frustration and lack of confidence." They were not, as a group, however, as discontent as the kindergarten through second grade group, though many begrudged that they were being held accountable for student behaviors and skills that they inherited from the primary grades. Many commented about being overwhelmed by "trying to do it all," while suggesting that other teachers weren't carrying their load. One teacher wrote, and it was confirmed by the teacher-consultants, that "kindergarten through third grade teachers do not feel the fourth grade writing test involves them. This was very evident to me from comments I heard during this session." Some third and fourth grade teachers said that they would have preferred filling out the form and mailing it in.

They spoke of being "too tired to think." These kinds of comments did not emerge from the fifth and sixth grade sessions, or the seventh and eighth-grade sessions, making teacher-consultants wonder if the earlier grades carry a greater burden. The third and fourth grade group offered many responses, especially on the survey itself. The focus groups tended to reinforce the written information.

In general, these teachers need to understand that across the state the improvement for North Carolina students achieving the standard score of 2.5 was only a 0.3 point change. When one looks only at one's own students, small differences up or down seem more dramatic. Teachers are in need of much more information about all state assessments, writing in particular. They did not seem to understand, for example, that the state third grade open-ended test involved writing an essay and that the essay might be on science content. Several stated the fourth grade writing assessment needed a rubric designed for that level, not realizing there is a rubric created by kindergarten through fourth grade teachers based on papers derived from fourth grade classes in North Carolina.

In general, teachers had a distrust of the state assessment and a lack of understanding about how statewide assessment goals and classroom instructional goals differ. One teacher said that she didn't understand how someone who wasn't a

fourth grade teacher, who didn't know Johnston County students, and who read a paper quickly ("Is it true that it is only eight seconds a paper?") could score a test accurately. Teachers seemed not to understand such testing criteria as validity and reliability (for example, they did not understand how having two prompts could destroy validity and reliability, not to mention the expense of scoring), did not know the origins of the assessment standards, did not understand the training of scorers, did not realize some aspects of test administration (for example, not knowing that special students could take more time if needed.) Only four out of sixty-three mentioned having workshops on the state writing test, and the only topic mentioned was holistic scoring.

Few teachers mentioned fluency or understanding of the writing process as having an influence on test scores. They may be seeing the test as a separate entity, requiring separate skills than general writing ability, and they may think that they should be concentrating on the test itself rather than developing writers in their classrooms. They resented that staff development was prompted by and geared toward making good scores on the writing test and not toward enhancing overall writing ability. Somehow, teachers saw focusing on the test and on the writing process as conflicting goals; others saw focusing on skills (sentences, grammar, mechanics) as in conflict with using writing process pedagogy. Still others felt that they needed to focus on attitudes, and that the process approach, journals, frequent writing, author's chair, etc., were not related to developing positive attitudes. Whereas many kindergarten through second grade teachers mentioned developing good attitudes and fostering creativity as important goals for the primary grades, many third and fourth grade teachers suggested that third and fourth grade students hated writing and resisted changing their writing, noting that they had inherited students with negative attitudes. They did not seem to link efforts to value writing in kindergarten through second grade with a student's ability to accept suggestions and criticisms. Most of this confusion results from teachers not being able to see the kindergarten through fourth grade writing program as a continuum and to define their individual grade level responsibilities within that sequence.

The survey indicates that the majority (forty-four of sixty-three) of third and fourth grade teachers have a confused understanding of the writing process in action, even if they can list the steps. Many seem to confuse the process of creating a narrative paper for the state assessment with a process pedagogical approach. Even those teachers who seem to have a general to good understanding of the stages of the writing process (N=19) mentioned beginning lessons with a "prompt," doing "timed writings," basing peer editing on the "characteristics of a '4' paper," and grading "holistically." These are terms associated with preparing for the fourth grade test, not with process pedagogy.

The third and fourth grade teachers showed better than average confidence in their ability to implement the process approach. On a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being high, the mean score was 3.47. However, they might be rating themselves on implementing something they call "the Johnston County writing curriculum," which may emphasize formula writing and grammar and mechanics rather than process strategies. One

teacher wrote that she was told not to teach a formula for the narrative test, even though she felt her students needed a formula to do well—again, the echoing question: do I focus on the writing test, or do I focus on other things about writing? The teachers might see the writing curriculum as discrete activities for preparing for the state test rather than integrated into the curriculum. In fact, a trend across the focus groups was a general confusion about what should be happening at each grade level, what the benchmarks are for grade-level writing achievement, and what the hallmarks of good writing are (rather than the characteristics of a four-point paper). Teachers indicated that there was no writing curriculum in place that aligned county goals with the state communication skills curriculum, certainly nothing that was grade-level specific. They also mentioned that there was no agreement on what other aspects of the curriculum must be attended to at each grade level, such as reading, and oral language. One teacher wrote, "Have the state department require third grade to teach less in science and math so we can spend more time on writing. Third grade students are expected to retain too much information." New teachers felt frustrated that they had no orientation or mentors. Others felt there was too much switching of assignments from year to year, so they could not develop confidence or strategies that were grade-level specific. They complained that they never had time to work with teachers at their grade levels, and that their administrators just didn't understand "how much time it takes in the curriculum to focus on writing." Obviously, they are in need of developing strategies for integrating writing into the other subjects they must address.

On the positive side, most of these third and fourth grade teachers were generally confident about their own abilities as writers, with a mean score of 3.57 on a 1 to 5 scale with 5 as high. However, most said that they did not want to attend staff development workshops where they had to write themselves. They might be more receptive if they wrote as part of a demonstration lesson aimed at their grade level, as happens in the writing project institutes. In such activities, teachers are actually completing the same tasks that they will implement with their own students, so they are learning pedagogy at the same time as they are writing.

Also on the positive side, many teachers expressed a real desire to know more and to do a better job. One teacher wrote that since she applied some new methods that she had learned in a workshop with Dr. Cunningham, she had seen such progress in her children that she was now more hopeful and felt more prepared. Seeing the impact of new strategies with their own children can be an energizing experience for teachers.

Teachers expressed some interest in having a person skilled in teaching writing act as a liaison between classroom teachers and county administrators, who they said have too many responsibilities to take on much leadership in terms of staff development in writing. They wanted someone who might come to their classes, look at their lessons, or answer individual questions. "I'd rather share my ignorance with another teacher than an administrator," said one teacher. Teachers also wanted to know if there could be a person identified as a liaison between the county and the state. They said there was a lack of communication among teachers within each school (no common planning periods) and among other schools.

Teachers said that consistency within grade levels, continuity across grade levels, reinforcing what other teachers have introduced, and developing new skills are either haphazard or done in a vacuum, exacerbated by the lack of a county communication skills curriculum and a writing coordinator. The teacher-consultants assured them that with the new county administration and site-based management was a new chance to be heard, beginning with this needs assessment.

In terms of staff development, teachers wanted released time and CEU credit to be offered. They said that they are too tired after school to take on more responsibilities. Like the kindergarten through second grade group, they wanted sessions with their colleagues at their grade levels. One teacher wrote, "I learn so much more when other grade levels are not involved." In practice, both kinds of sessions are probably needed for the third and fourth grade group, because if third grade teachers meet only with third grade teachers, for example, they will not achieve the continuity across grade levels which is needed. More than other groups, the thirty-four teachers wanted a workshop focused on the state test, even though they resisted the idea of thinking that the state test writing exemplifies what their students can do. Most of all they wanted some kind of consistent, strong message about how they might help their students write better. One teacher wrote, "I've been to a lot of writing workshops over the years, and everyone told us something different. No one can seem to get together on what is supposed to be done."

A summary of each item in the third and fourth grade teachers' survey is attached. Recommendations for acting on the kindergarten through eighth grade needs assessment are also attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruie J. Pritchard, Ph.D.

APPENDIX E: 1995 SELF-ASSESSMENT FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Please rate yourself on the following behaviors in terms of how much each characterizes you:

a. I understand the writing process:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

b. I understand the role of writing in the learning process:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

c. I promote writing as important in the total curriculum:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

d. I know what's happening in classrooms:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

e. I distribute information on staff development offerings (within and outside of the district) and books and materials relevant to teaching writing:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

f. I make the SDPI materials on the writing test accessible:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

g. I create opportunities for teachers to work with other teachers on their teams/grade levels or in their departments, as well as across grade levels:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

h. I offer personal and professional support to teachers in my school:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

i. I am open to teachers' input and ideas:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

not true of me **very true of me**

APPENDIX F: JAWP MISSION AND VISION STATEMENT

Mission Statement

The Johnston Area Writing Partnership alliance with the Capital Area Writing Project seeks to develop the confidence and competence of teachers who will share their expertise in creating a climate conducive to improving the teaching and learning of writing in Johnston County classrooms.

Vision Statement

The Johnston Area Writing Partnership, working with the Capital Area Writing Project, will provide staff development for personal and professional growth for teachers in order to improve instructional practices in the teaching of writing.

Background

The Johnston Area Writing Partnership (JAWP) is comprised of a group of concerned teachers from across grade levels, disciplines, and schools in the district. A goal of JAWP is to improve student writing achievement and attitudes about writing through the training of their teachers. The Johnston Area Writing Partnership alliance with the Capital Area Writing Project (CAWP), a National Writing Project site at NCSU, was officially formulated September 9, 1994, from a foundation of twelve Johnston County classroom teachers who had received fellowships to participate in CAWP summer institutes. As of fall 2000, approximately 13,983 contact hours have accrued for Johnston County teachers who have participated in summer institutes and staff development offerings throughout the school year. The topics for the level I and II institutes are based on NWP principles and on those cited by the CEE Commission on Inservice Education in "Inservice Education: Ten Principles" (*English Education*, May 1994). These principles and their application to JAWP are as follows:

1. Teacher participation and reflection on that participation will affirm that "learning is the key to better teaching."

2. Informed teachers will decide if and when instructional change is desirable.

3. Teachers must be knowledgeable about current research and theory to truly grow professionally and to foster growth in their students.

4. Teachers who are expected to change must have opportunities to collaborate in the decision-making process. Peer support and encouragement are necessary for growth.

5. When teachers have a role in decision-making processes, professional growth soars.

6. Since change is a process, teachers must be allowed sufficient time to achieve change.

7. Teachers need administrators as partners in the process of creating change and setting common goals and visions.

8. Teachers acknowledge that the involvement of the entire community strengthens the school-community relationship and thus is best for student learning.

9. Teachers accept and encourage cultural differences in students while they strive to build democratic classrooms.

10. Teacher participation in JAWP must be supported explicitly and tangibly by the professional community.

APPENDIX G: FOLLOW-UP NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Teacher Survey for 1995 and 1996

School Name: _____

Grade Level: _____

Have you participated in a writing institute? _____

Did you complete a response to question 2 (below) in the spring 1994 meetings held at SSS with teachers from the Capital Area Writing Project?_____

1. Rate yourself using a 1–5 scale (1 = low ability/confidence in using; 5 = high ability/confidence in using) on your ability/confidence to implement the following instructional practices:

   train students to work in peer groups: 1.....2.....3.....4.....5
   low **high**

   use a variety of prewriting strategies: 1.....2.....3.....4.....5
   low **high**

   teach a variety of revising strategies: 1.....2.....3.....4.....5
   low **high**

   specify grading criteria (create rubrics): 1.....2.....3.....4.....5
   low **high**

   teach grammar and mechanics: 1.....2.....3.....4.....5
   low **high**

   plan and evaluate writing portfolios: 1.....2.....3.....4.....5
   low **high**

2. Briefly describe how you address the stages of the writing process in your instruction (use back).

Surveys have to be returned in order for information to be gleaned from them.

APPENDIX H: SANDRA'S TIPS FOR GETTING RESPONSES TO SURVEYS

Traditionally, there is a low rate of return, so a gimmick is needed. In 1998, I sent out fifty-eight surveys to people who attended writing workshops that year and got back fifty-six—a 98 percent return rate. I only sent surveys to teachers who had attended four or more sessions so they would have an opinion about our work, and I also made sure the survey would get their attention.

I created a colorful packet of information that included: a brightly colored delivery envelope (card shops throw away boxes of envelopes in all sizes and colors every time they change displays; some stores will give you the envelopes if you ask), the survey, a credit slip for teacher certification renewal credits, a memo from me thanking them for having attending the workshops and thanking them in advance for filling out the surveys, a brightly colored return envelope, and ten colorful stickers the teachers could use in their classrooms. The packets were so colorful they couldn't get lost in the pile of white paper that usually covers a teacher's desk, and the teachers loved getting the free stickers!

APPENDIX I: 1996 FOLLOW-UP SURVEY FOR PRINCIPALS

School Name: _____

Dear Principal:

This survey is made by the Johnston Area Writing Partnership (JAWP) in order to catalog all the efforts made to improve writing by and in individual schools. This will help us get a better picture of the range and variety of ways in which schools are addressing the improvement of writing instruction and/or student writing achievement.

Please list as many specific efforts or activities as you can that show how your teachers and students have addressed writing in the curriculum during the last two years (1994–1996). These may be direct, formal ways (e.g., sponsoring staff development in writing or young authors conferences, training parents to respond to writing); or indirect, informal ways (e.g., making writing a curriculum emphasis in your school's goals, creating bulletin boards of student writing, sending faculty to conferences, etc.). Don't be modest! Include everything that you think relates.

APPENDIX J: 1996 INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR SELECTED JAWP PARTICIPANTS

What is your background in the teaching of writing?

Do other teachers in your grade-level team have similar backgrounds in writing?

Did your grade-level team work as a group to plan activities for teaching writing? Or did each do his or her own thing?

Did you meet with other teachers to discuss writing? How often? Were these meetings devoted to writing or part of a regular team meeting?

Was your group concerned if each individual was working on writing?

If you did not work as a group, why not?

If you did work as a group, did anyone emerge as a leader? Why do you think that happened?

Were you pleased with your school's test results?

What was the role of your principal in preparing for the state writing test? Was he or she supportive? Indifferent? Threatening?

Did your school do any site-based writing inservice? Who provided it? Who decided on a writing emphasis: the teachers, principal, staff development team, or central office?

Was there a particular point when you began to see progress with students in their writing?

What do you feel was your most successful strategy for helping students understand what was expected of them in learning the forms of writing tested on the state test?

What do you think you did that made the biggest impact on your students' ability to write?

Did you learn anything new at any of the JAWP workshops? Did you feel that your attendance at most sessions was worthwhile? Did you use any of the strategies you learned at JAWP workshops?

What, if any, workshop topics have benefited you most?

If you were in charge of the writing program at your school, what would you do to create the perfect setting for all children to learn to write?

What, if anything, do you think the county or school district could do to help you improve as a teacher of writing?

APPENDIX K: TOPICS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN WRITING

1997–1998

September
Picture Mapping
Untangling the Mystery of Rubrics and Assessments

October
Making Big Words and Words on the Wall
Revision and Peer Groups, Part I
Read It, Draw It, and Write About It

November
Using Figurative Language to Increase Writing Proficiency
Revision and Peer Groups, Part II
Verbs, Adjectives, and Power Words
Classroom Newspapers

December
"We Ain't Supposed to Write in Here" (Social Studies, Science, and Art)
Writing in Math/Implications for Learning
Super Sentences

January
Beginnings: Grab the Readers' Attention
Endings that Satisfy

February
Draw and Write
Animalia Alliteration
The Right Way into a Good Lead
The Right Way to Start Writing

March
Technology and Writing

April
Poetry Alive! Using Poetry in the Classroom

May
Writing Celebration

APPENDIX L: EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SESSION

Title of Session: _____ Date: _____

Your subject area: _____

Grade: _____ Are you a guest? _____ Are you a JAWP fellow? _____

Please rate the session on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).

1. The presenter was knowledgeable and well-organized. _____

   Comments:

2. The presenter had appropriate style of delivery. _____

   Comments:

3. The strategies and teaching ideas seem valid. _____

   Comments:

4. The handouts and other learning aids enhanced the presentation. _____

   Comments:

5. The content was substantive and adaptable to various levels and subjects. _____

   Comments:

6. The facilities for meeting were adequate. _____

   Comments:

7. My overall estimation of this session: _____

   Comments

APPENDIX M: GROWTH OF THE JOHNSTON AREA WRITING PARTNERSHIP

Focused attempts at building capacity started with 1997 professional development activities as a result of PON participation.

YEAR/ACTIVITY	SESSIONS/ HOURS	NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING JAWP/GUESTS**	TOTAL CONTACT HOURS*** (REPRESENTING 28 SCHOOLS)	PON CONTACT HOURS**** (REPRESENTING 6 SCHOOLS)
1994–1995 JAWP *	6/24	(J37)	(J702)	(J150)/21 % of total attending
1995 SI[1]	10/60	42	2374	516/23%
1995–1996 JAWP *	7/22	(J52)	(J604)	(J196)/32%
1996 SI	10/60	30	1752	348/20%
1996–1997 JAWP	6/14	(J59)	(J432)	(J196)/45%
1997 SI	8/60	50	2664	496/19%
1997–1998 JAWP[2]	9/20	131 total =(J54) + G77	596 =(J296) + G300	298 =(J127) + G171/50%
1998 SI	8/60	14[3]	840	300/37%
1998–1999 JAWP	4/8	118 total =(J35) + G83	340=(J118) + G222	224=(J70) + G154/68%
1999 SI	10/60	27	1380	420
1999–2000 JAWP	6/40	60 total =(J9) + G51	454/= (J202) + G252[4]	(J454) (100%)
2000 SI	8/60	24	1440	0
2000–2001 JAWP	2/3	135 total =(J45) + G90	(J405)	(J108)/27%
2001 SI	10/80	35	2800	320/11%
		Total participants for all activities = 814 Total SIs: 222 Total JAWP: 592 = (J291) + G301	Total contact hours: 16,783 Total SIs: 13,250 Total JAWP: 2,759 Total guests: 774	Total PON hours: 4026/24% of total Total SIs: 2400/18% Total JAWP: 1626/46%

JAWP (J) = school year professional development activities.
JAWP* = sessions only for participants assigned by principals to represent schools.
** J= participants trained in JAWP or CAWP summer institutes.
G= guest teachers from Johnston County attending individual sessions only.
*** Contact hours based on attendance rolls for all offerings.
**** PON refers to six target schools.

1 SI refers to the introductory summer institute.
2 In 1997, JAWP school year-activities were opened to all teachers in the system's 28 schools.
3 Writing scores across the county went up in 1997–98 and attendance at summer institute went down. Other county-sponsored professional development initiatives eroded attendance.
4 1999–2000, two Project Outreach Network (PON) schools were the focus for professional development during the school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Patsy Butler, a teacher instructional support specialist, has taught primary, elementary, middle, and academically gifted students for twenty-six years in Johnston County, North Carolina. She serves as co-director of the Johnston Area Writing Partnership and has worked with Sandra O'Berry designing writing curriculum for kindergarten through eighth grades in Johnston County. She and Sandra have presented at conferences throughout the United States and are coauthors of "Project Outreach Transforms Professional Development," in *The Voice: A Newsletter of the National Writing Project.*

Sandra O'Berry, co-director of the Capital Area Writing Project at North Carolina State University and co-director of the Johnston Area Writing Partnership in Johnston County, has taught art in the public schools since 1969, mostly at Smithfield Elementary School in Smithfield, North Carolina. She loves teaching third to fifth grade students at her school, but every year looks forward to working with teachers during the summer and helping them realize how much they know about teaching writing. Sandra is a coauthor with Patsy Butler of "Project Outreach Transforms Professional Development," *The Voice: A Newsletter of the National Writing Project.*

Ruie J. Pritchard, coordinator of English education and director of the Capital Area Writing Project at North Carolina State University, began her career as a high school English teacher and in 1981 earned a Ph.D. in teaching writing. Her particular interests are effective strategies for building literacy, developing local leadership capacity among teachers, and system reform. She leads workshops and publishes widely in these areas. For a list of publications see *http://www2.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/project/prof_dev_res/.* Her professional honors include a Fulbright Scholarship to New Zealand and, in 2001, the North Carolina State University Distinguished Professor Award for service and extension. Ruie has published in *Research in the Teaching of English* and many other publications.

The authors, Patsy Butler, Ruie Pritchard, and Sandra O'Berry, responding to some "bright ideas!"

Other titles available in the National Writing Project at Work series:

Volume 1: Models *of* Inservice

No. 1 The Story of SCORE: The Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute Takes on a Statewide Reading Initiative
by Lynette Herring-Harris and Cassandria Hansbrough
Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute

No. 2 On Site Consulting: New York City Writing Project
by Nancy Mintz and Alan Stein, introduction by Marcie Wolfe
New York City Writing Project

No. 3 The Johnston Area Writing Partnership: The Capital Area Writing Project Model for Building District Capacity to Offer Quality Professional Development
by Rue Pritchard, Sandra O'Berry, and Patsy Butler
Capital Area Writing Project

No. 4 The Fledgling Years: Lessons from the First Four Years of the National Writing Project in Vermont
by Patricia McGonegal and Anne Watson
National Writing Project in Vermont

For more information regarding the National Writing Project at Work monograph series, call 510-642-0963, or visit the National Writing Project website at www.writingproject.org.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Writing Project
University of California
2105 Bancroft, #1042
Berkeley, CA 94720-1042

Telephone: 510-642-0963
Fax: 510-642-4545
Email: nwp@writingproject.org
www.writingproject.org

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").